



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL PROBLEMS OF THE SECOND PART OF ISAIAH.

II.

THE next passages to be considered are two long pieces which, according to Ewald, were added to his work by the prophet himself, viz., lxi. 1 to lxiii. 6, and lxiii. 7—lxvi. 24. This is clearly a mistake. The truth is that lxi. 1—lxii. 12 is in no proper sense an appended passage, but forms the last section of the Second Book of the Restoration-Prophecy; whether this book has come down to us complete, is a question into which I cannot now enter. The real first appendix is (*g*) lxiii. 1-6. Hitzig long ago remarked that this passage was but loosely connected with the Restoration Prophecy, and it was not a step in advance to treat it, as Ewald did, as the fourth strophe of the epilogue of that book. Ewald himself, however, admits that it is not by the Second Isaiah. He ascribes it to the author of Isa. lviii. and lix. (the Second Isaiah having merely adopted it), and in this, he shows perhaps more insight than the greatest of his pupils, Dillmann. For though this fine dramatic passage may be not unworthy of the Second Isaiah, of whom the phrase "the day of vengeance" (ver. 4; cf. lxi. 2) reminds us, yet Dillmann cannot seriously attach much weight to this argument, or deny that the passage may just as well have proceeded from another writer of the same school. The eschatological tone of the prophecy, and the singling out of Edom as the representative of the foes of Yahveh, are quite in harmony with a post-Exile date, especially if it be admitted that both Isa. xxxiv. and the Book of Joel are best understood as post-Exile works. You will observe that all hope of

human help has been abandoned by the writer—there is no Cyrus in the distance, precisely as in lix. 16, which is copied almost word for word in lxiii. 5. I hold therefore that lxiii. 1-6 not only forms no part of the Restoration Prophecy, but is not even an independent fragment by the same author. It was written later than that work (hence the allusion to it in ver. 4), and later too, but perhaps not much later, than Isa. lix., from which it borrows. The reign of the second or third Artaxerxes will, as we shall see later on, fully account for its tone and contents.

We have now to study the second of Ewald's appended passages. It is one of the most fascinating parts of the Second Isaiah, and it contains a liturgical prayer of almost too thrilling interest. The reader will therefore not grudge it a somewhat detailed examination. It is not, as Ewald thought, a single connected work, but falls into three distinct parts, (*h*) lxiii. 7 to lxiv. 12 (11), (*i*) lxv., and (*k*) lxvi. In this division I agree with Dillmann, so far as chap. lxvi. is concerned, but not as to lxiii. 7 to lxv. 25, which this critic considers to be a single composition. I have given elsewhere the reasons for my own course,¹ and do not find that Dillmann's counter-argument touches them. Among the other commentators, Delitzsch has not altered this part of his work since 1866, while Bredenkamp, quite independently, coincides with me. I have now to ask, Can any of these three passages be plausibly ascribed to the Second Isaiah? Looking at them together, most will, I think, agree with Ewald, that 'the character of the style has become markedly different' as compared with the style of the preceding prophecies. It is true that he adds later on that 'the differences between this and the previous book are too unimportant to permit us to think that we have here another author'; but had his commentary been on a more extended scale, Ewald would have found it difficult to prove this to be the case, and he partly neutralises the force of his own statement by declaring in the very next sentence

¹ Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, ii. 114.

that a good many sayings from the book of the somewhat older prophet, which he finds in chaps. lvi., lvii., and elsewhere, may be reproduced in this appendix also.¹

Let us then search for any evidence of date supplied by (h) lxiii. 7 to lxiv. 12 (11). Notice first in any good commentary, the large number of parallel passages in Psalms. Where is there anything like this in Isa. xl.-lv.? It is not enough to reply that the phenomenon arises from the nature of the subject, that the prophet here prays in the name of the Church, and that later liturgical poets would naturally be influenced by his work. That is precisely what has to be explained. How comes it that a prophet has been converted into a liturgical poet? I know that there are bursts of lyric poetry in Isaiah xl.-lv., but not of liturgical poetry like this. Chapter xxvi. is more like it, and that is demonstrably post-Exilic. There was no Jewish Church-nation during the Exile. And when we find that one of the chief peculiarities of our passage as distinguished from the undoubted work of Second Isaiah, viz., its almost unmitigated gloom, recurs in Psalms like lxxiv., lxxx., and lxxxix., none of which can be proved to be earlier than the third Artaxerxes, we are bound to consider very seriously whether our passage may not really be a liturgical composition of the same period. And observe (b) the very marked religious views expressed in lxiii. 7, etc. The writer speaks as if it is not the Jews who need to return to Yahveh (as the Second Isaiah says, lv. 7), but Yahveh who is reluctant to return to them; not the Jews, whose iniquities have produced God's wrath, but his wrath, of which their iniquities are the fatal consequence (lxiii. 17, lxiv. 5-7). He also implies a belief that the patriarchs Abraham and Jacob can, under ordinary circumstances, help their distressed descendants (lxiii. 16). Notice this too, (c) that whereas the Second Isaiah ascribes the deliverances of the olden time to Yahveh, the writer of this prophecy

¹ *The Prophets*, E.T., iv. 341, 342.

(whom I cannot help distinguishing from the Second Isaiah) speaks in one verse of the "Angel of Yahveh's face," and in two other verses of "his Spirit of holiness," as the deliverer and guide of the people of Israel. The former expression occurs nowhere else, and marks a time when minute details of Scripture (see Exodus xxxii. 34, xxxiii. 14) were compared and harmonised; the latter reminds us of the late Book of Nehemiah (ix. 20) and of a Deutero-Isaianic and therefore post-Exilic psalm (li. 13). And (*d*) that, according to a *certain* correction of lxiii. 18, the occupation of the "holy mountain" by the Jews had lasted only "for a little while." Surely, unless all other evidence converges to show that the prophecy is Exilic, we must explain this not on the principle of the "pathetic fallacy," but as the literally correct expression of a post-Exilic writer. Lastly (*e*), let the extraordinary combination of black despair and brightest faith presented to us in lxiii. 15-lxiv. 12 have its full effect on the mind. Can that be explained on the old theory? What is there in the faintest degree like it in the true Second Isaiah? Contrast lxiii. 15 with xlii. 14, xlix. 15.

But, it may be asked, how are we to explain certain exegetical data in this section which have been thought to favour the authorship of the *Second Isaiah*? (1) Why, for instance, is there no reference to the fall of Babylon in the retrospect of God's past lovingkindnesses? The Exodus from Egypt is described in pathetic language (lxiii. 11-14); why not also the Exodus from Chaldæa? Does it not look as if Israel were still under the Babylonian yoke? No; the inference would be a mistaken one. The writer of this liturgical poem follows the lead of the post-Exilic psalmists, who habitually refer to God's "wonders of old time" as typical specimens of providential working (see *e.g.* Psalm lxxvi. 4-8, cxxxvi. 10-18, and compare Isaiah xliii. 16, 17). Next (2), what is to be said of the affinity between parts of this section and the Book of Lamentations? Compare *e.g.* lxiii. 15 with Lamentations iv. 50;

lxiv. 5b-7 with Lamentations iii. 42-44; lxiv. 11 (Hebrew 10; כִּי־מִצְדֵּי־יְיָ "our pleasant things") with Lamentations i. 10. The fact is of no critical importance. The parallelisms, excepting the last, which will be referred to again presently, are but general, and simply show that the style of the *kînôth* was not a lost secret. Lastly (3), must we not infer from lxiv. 10, 11 that the land of Judah was still suffering from the Chaldæan devastation, and that the temple and the "pleasant things" which it contained were still in ashes? Consequently, must not the author be the Second Isaiah? The inference would be a hasty one. If we are to take these two verses (lxiv. 10, 11) literally, it would seem that the writer is an eyewitness of the desolation which he describes, and the Second Isaiah was certainly not that. Nor is the phrase "thy holy cities" consistent with the theory of an Exilic date. The true Second Isaiah knows of only one holy city (xlvi. 2, compare lii. 1); the first writer who represents the entire land of Judah as "holy" is Zechariah¹ (Zechariah ii. 16). It is true that the only burning of the temple of which we have any record in pre-Christian times is the famous one under Nebuchadrezzar. But it is perfectly possible that the description in lxiv. 10, 11 (or at any rate in verse 11) was inserted by an after-thought to make this liturgical poem available as a memorial of two great troubles, equal in their terribleness, though not entirely coincident in their details. For a parallel I venture to refer to Ps. lxxiv., which refers seemingly, with all the pathos of an eyewitness, to the burning of the temple, and yet must, as many think, be a Maccabæan psalm.²

It remains, therefore, to seek for a suitable home for this great poem in the post-Exilic period. May we place it, like Ps. lxxiv., among the monuments of the Maccabean movement, or at least of the dark years which preceded it? I think not. First, because it can be shown to stand among

¹ See Baudissin, *Studien zur semit. Religionsgeschichte*, ii. 129.

² Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures on the Psalms*, p. 103.

compositions of the Persian age; and secondly, because it breathes a spirit of such intense penitence. The Macca-bean poets, even including the author of Ps. xlv., are filled with the consciousness of Israel's perfect obedience to his God. But this liturgical poet says, "And we all became as one who is unclean," etc. (Isa. lxiv. 6, 7). I infer, therefore, that the injuries from which Israel was suffering when lxiii. 7—lxiv. 12 (11) was written, had not been inflicted out of vengeance for Israel's devotion to its religion; they were the ordinary cruelties of a non-Israelitish ruler, through which, according to the traditional theology, Yahveh might be regarded as punishing the sins of his people. Who, then, was the most cruel of the successors of Cyrus, and whose was the reign which, from the misery which it caused, might most fittingly be compared with that of Nebuchadrezzar? From the form in which I have put this question, it will be clear that I do not accept Kuenen's opinion that the occasion of this poem may have been the "affliction and reproach" spoken of in Neh. i. 3, when the walls of Jerusalem, set up probably by Ezra, were broken down, and the gates thereof burned with fire. I feel very strongly that this document presupposes an even greater affliction than that described in Neh. i. 3. Moreover, the dates to which we have been led to refer the neighbouring prophecies point to a somewhat later period, and the fact that Artaxerxes Longimanus was not disliked as a king by the subject peoples of itself suggests that it was another and a far more terrible king to whom the present misery of Judah and Jerusalem was due. Indeed, the destruction of Ezra's walls was probably the work, not of any satrap or general of the "great king," but of Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem, who were afterwards united in opposition to the rebuilding of the walls by Nehemiah. Surely it is to the last century of the Persian rule that we have to look—to the period when the doleful book of Ecclesiastes was probably written—and our choice must lie between the reigns of Artaxerxes Mnemon and

Artaxerxes Ochus. The former reign was no doubt by no means a happy one. It was Artaxerxes Mnemon who corrupted the purity of the Persian religion by introducing the cultus of the goddess Anâhita (Ἀναΐτις), which must have alienated the children of those who had looked up to Cyrus as the friend of Yahveh. It was also in his reign (if the natural interpretation of τοῦ ἄλλου Ἀρταξέρξου in Jos. *Ant.*, XI. vii. 1 be followed) that the so-called pollution of the temple by the Persian general Bagôses took place, whose harshness, though not entirely undeserved, must have still further embittered the already painful relations between the Persians and the Jews. It is probable enough that the latter, as well as the Syrians, Phœnicians, and other nations, were concerned in the great revolt of B.C. 363 (or 362), and certain that they took part in the rebellion which marked the beginning of the reign of Ochus, between B.C. 358 and 350 (or 345).¹ It is to this latter period that I would refer the composition of this poem. The energetic Persian king had taken the field with an army consisting of 300,000 infantry and 30,000 cavalry. He had invaded and reconquered Egypt, had destroyed Sidon, and reduced the other Phœnician cities to submission, and now to punish the Jews he was about to deport some of them to Hyrcania by the Caspian Sea, and others to Babylon.² Was not the foretaste of this misery almost enough to break the heart of a fervent religious

¹ On the latter date, see Nöldeke in *Encycl. Brit.*, XVIII., 580.

² Syncellus (Dindorf), i. 486: "Ὁχος Ἀρταξέρξου παῖς εἰς Αἴγυπτον στρατεύων μερικὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν εἶλεν Ἰουδαίων, ὧν τοὺς μὲν ἐν Ὑρκανίᾳ κατέψκισε πρὸς τῇ Κασπίᾳ θαλάσῃ, τοὺς δὲ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι οἱ καὶ μέχρι νῦν εἰσὶν αὐτόθι, ὡς πολλοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἱστοροῦσιν. The omission of any reference to this melancholy episode in Jewish history both in Chronicles and in Josephus is satisfactorily explained by Grätz in the English article mentioned below. The statement of the Syncellus is derived from the Chronicle of Eusebius, the original text of which is unhappily lost. On the various later forms of this passage, see Grätz *Geschichte*, II. (2), p. 209; JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, Jan. 1891, pp. 208, 209; and cf. H. Bois, *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* (Lausanne), 1890, p. 561, etc.

patriot, and to extract from it the passionate cry,—“Oh, that thou didst rend the heavens, that thou didst come down, that the mountains shook at thy presence, as when a fire of brushwood kindleth, to make thy name known to thine adversaries, so that nations trembled before thee, while thou didst terrible things which we hoped not for!” (lxiv. 1-3.) And if in the preceding verses the writer paints the calamities of Israel in slightly too gloomy colours —“We are become (like) those over whom thou hast never borne rule,” *i.e.*, our existence as a nation is destroyed—can we be severe upon him? Israel was indeed “afflicted and ready to die” (Ps. lxxxviii. 16), and a *μερικὴ αἰχμαλωσία* (as Syncellus calls it) had been ordered, if not as yet carried out, by the Persian tyrant. The barbarous character of Ochus, and his recent inhumanity towards the Phœnicians and Egyptians, can have been no secrets to the Jews. This is how Nöldeke describes the former in terms which labour to be impartial. He was “one of those great despots who can raise up again for a time a decayed Oriental empire, who shed blood without scruple, and are not nice in the choice of means.”¹ At the very outset he proved this by the massacre of his nearest relations, and at the capture of Sidon he brought the same fact home to the peoples of Palestine by his cruel treatment of the conquered city, anticipating which more than 40,000 Sidonians are said to have burned themselves within their houses.² And soon afterwards in Egypt, as Nöldeke remarks, he “seems to have made the *væ victis* thoroughly clear to the Egyptians, and to have treated even their religion with little more respect than Cambyses before him.”³ Surely, if Isa. lxiii. 1-6 may be fitly referred to the end of the reign of the second or the beginning of that of the third Artaxerxes, Isa. lxiii. 7—lxiv. 12 (11) may with even greater reason be explained by the cruel treatment of the Jews by Ochus, which the writer naturally regards (though he qualifies

¹ *Encycl. Britannica*, XVIII., 580.

² *Diod. Sic.*, XVI., 41-45.

³ *Enc. Brit.*, XVIII., 580.

this view in a manner peculiar to himself) as a judgment upon the sins of his people.

I venture to hope that the preceding result is an improvement upon that given in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* in 1881, where I supposed this poem to be a monument of the early years of the Exile. I was led to it by studying the supposed Maccabean and certain other psalms, more especially the 89th. And here let me refer to Ewald and to Professor Robertson Smith.

In the third and last edition of his *Dichter des Alter Bundes*, the former critic refers a group of psalms, including xliv., lxxiv., lxxix., lxxxix., to the end of the sixth and beginning of the fifth century. But in the first and second editions he expressed a different opinion, viz. that all these psalms belonged to the end of the fifth century, and more particularly to the troubles connected with Bagôses. In other words, he prefers the reign of Artaxerxes II. to that of Artaxerxes III., for the very weak reason that, as he thinks, the revolt at the beginning of the reign of the latter did not extend to Jerusalem. The theory of Professor Robertson Smith is a similar one, but more defensible, inasmuch as he refers the psalms in question (Ps. xliv., lxxiv., lxxix., lxxx.) to the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus. In his excellent article on the Psalms he makes this statement:—"There is one and only one time in the Persian period to which they can be referred, viz., that of the great civil wars under Artaxerxes III. Ochus (middle of fourth century B.C.). The Jews were involved in these, and were sorely chastised, and we know from Josephus that the Temple was defiled by the Persians, and humiliating conditions attached to the worship there. It would appear that to the Jews the struggle took a theocratic aspect, and it is not impossible that the hopeful beginnings of a national movement, which proved in the issue so disastrous, are reflected in some of the other pieces of the collection."¹

¹ *Encycl. Brit.*, XX., 31.

The conjecture that "to the Jews the struggle took a theocratic aspect," does not appear to me a probable one. The pseudo-Hecataeus, indeed, quoted by Josephus (*c. Ap. i. 22*), tells us of cruel deaths suffered by the Jews for their religion in the Persian period. But this late forgery gives a very precarious support to the hypothesis. The view of Ewald and Prof. Robertson Smith I have elsewhere (*Bampton Lectures on the Psalms*, pp. 91, 102) given my reasons for rejecting. I am thankful, however, for their distinct admission that the calamitous second century of the Persian rule in Palestine must have left some literary monuments in corners of the canonical books. Among these monuments I should myself reckon, not only the liturgical poem in Second Isaiah but certain psalms, not quite the same as are given by either of these two critics, but at any rate the 89th, which Ewald also mentions, and the beginning of which in particular so strikingly reminds us of Isaiah lxiii. 7, also the Book of Joel, and (in its present form) that of Zechariah. But I must now hasten to (*i*), (*k*), *i.e.*, the very difficult 65th and 66th chapters, which must however be treated provisionally as separate pieces. It has been usual to regard the former as the answer of Yahveh to the preceding liturgical prayer. I have elsewhere given reasons (which need scarcely be repeated here) for believing that the opinion of the majority of expositors is mistaken,¹ nor has the latest commentator, Dillmann, to any material extent impaired the force of my arguments. Of course, the only object of attempting to do so would be to show that chaps. lxiii. 7—lxv. form an integral part of the great Prophecy of Restoration. If it be true that several passages preceding chap. lxv. have been composed and added to that prophecy by other hands than those of the author, it will be a point of subordinate importance to show that chap. lxv. is by the writer of lxiii. 7—lxiv. Let us however, for the moment, put aside the controversy as to the dis-

¹ Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, ii. 114.

puted passages in chaps. xl.—lxiv., and limit our view to chap. lxv. What are the reasons for thinking that this passage at least is not a monument of the Exile? 1. Nothing is said even in lxv. 8—10, about the return from Babylon. Notice the situation implied. Israel (called “Jacob” and “Judah” in ver. 9) is all but destroyed, and cannot hope to take the entire Land of Promise in possession. Yet Israel is not to despond. From Jacob, who seems on the point of death, Yahveh will bring forth a seed of those who shall truly serve him. Of these, and of the survivors of the past generation (cf. ver. 8*b*, “my servants”) it is said, “My servants shall dwell there.” Where then is the Jacob or Judah spoken of, from which the seed is to spring? The fathers of the righteous seed, at any rate, are already in Palestine. There is no reference to a return from Babylon (contrast lvii. 13*b*, 14), because the return is a thing of the past. What *is* wanted is the expulsion of heathen intruders, by a population of righteous Israelites who are in enjoyment of the divine favour (cf. xxvi. 2, 18). And now turn to ver. 18. Is it not reasonable to suppose that Jerusalem when the prophet wrote was already an inhabited city, though so far below its high ideal that it had, as it were, to be created anew in order that its divine Lord might take pleasure in it? 2. Now, a second reason why this part is probably not of Exilic origin. Notice the strange bitterness which pervades the passage. The Second Isaiah, in the passages which are undoubtedly his, has to plead and argue with those Israelites who, not altogether inexcusably, still believe more or less in the power of the heathen gods. But listen to the alternate rise and fall of our prophet’s vehement denunciation in chap. lxv., and say if it is in the manner of the Second Isaiah.¹

3. My third reason shall be drawn from lxv. 11, 12:—
“And as for you that forsake Yahveh, that forget my

¹ On the difficult passage, lxv. 15, may I refer to my own explanation in the *Expositor*, August, 1891?

holy mountain, that set in order a table for Gad, and fill up mixed drink for M'nî—I destine you for the sword, and ye all to the slaughter shall bow down, because I called and ye did not answer, I spoke, and ye did not hearken, but did that which was evil in mine eyes, and chose that in which I had no pleasure." That Gad and M'nî were Syrian deities, is not to be denied; the evidence, especially that relative to Gad, is overwhelmingly strong. No name corresponding philologically either to Gad or to M'nî has yet been found in the religious tablets of Babylonia. Nor does the accurate and trustworthy Dillmann dispute this. All that he can say in arrest of judgment is that "possibly Gad and M'nî are merely Hebrew appellations of divinities which had other names in Babylonia." This might pass if Gad and M'nî had not an actual existence in the post-Exilic Aramæan Pantheon, but hardly otherwise.

Such are the reasons which seem to me to favour a post-Exilic date for this chapter. Their force will be increased, if we admit the same date for some of the preceding passages, and especially for the next chapter (lxvi.). But the complexity of the problem being so great, I am anxious, before passing on, to consider the arguments which may be drawn from this chapter in favour of an Exilic date. Thus 1, there are a certain number of points of contact both in language and in ideas with the acknowledged Second Isaiah. Compare for instance lxx. 9, "an inheritor of my mountains," with lvii. 13*b* (noticing, however, that the return from Babylon is referred to in lvii. 14, but not in lxx. 9); *ib.* "mine elect" and "my servants" with xlii. 1 (where, however, it is the sing. not the plur.); v. 16, "the former troubles are forgotten," with liv. 4; v. 17, "new heavens and a new earth," with li. 16; v. 19, "I will rejoice in Jerusalem," with lxii. 5; v. 21 "plant vineyards, and eat their fruit," with lxii. 8, 9; v. 22, "as the days of the trees," with lxi. 3. Note also that there is no reference to a Church-nation in chap. lxx., any more than there is in the acknowledged Second Isaiah (contrast

lxiii. 7—lxiv.). There is only a remnant of those who hold fast to Yahveh—only a few good grapes in the cluster (lxv. 8). I do not admit, however, that these facts are valid evidence that chap. lxv. belongs to the Second Isaiah. The phraseological evidence is slight indeed, nor must we omit to notice the strange idioms אֱלֹהֵי אֲמִן¹ (v. 16), and פִּאֲדָר for יִרְדֵּי (v. 25).

Is the evidence from ideas more conclusive? Scarcely. The “new heavens and new earth” in ver. 17 belong to a more advanced stage of religious thought than the expressions in li. 16 and the awkwardly expressed passage on the longevity of the later Jews (ver. 20) has nothing corresponding to it in the admitted work of the Second Isaiah, who is fully occupied with the idea of the eternity of the nation. And as for the discrepancy between chap. lxv. and lxiii. 7—lxiv., it surely does not oblige us to separate these sections by a long interval. We are at perfect liberty to regard them as contemporaneous, or nearly so, *i.e.*, as written early in the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus. For the views which the two prophecies respectively take of Israel are by no means incapable of reconciliation. The author of lxiii. 7—lxiv. preserves the conception of the national unity of Israel at the cost of admitting that “there was no one who called on the name of Yahveh, and that stirred himself up to take hold of Yahveh” (lxiv. 7). And perhaps there may have been a great spiritual decline in Israel; perhaps the facts warranted a gloomy view of Israel as a whole. But there must certainly have been many holy men of the school of these prophetic writers. And the author of chapter lxv. was on his side fully justified in repudiating the unworthy members of Israel, and claiming for the righteous remnant, the promised favour of Yahveh (lxv. 8-10). To him this remnant was the true Israel, the germ of the nation that was to

¹ The case is not greatly improved if for אֱלֹהֵי אֲמִן we read אֱלֹהֵי אֲמִן, for this word only occurs in Isa. xxv. 1 (post-Exilic).

be. The second, third, and fourth arguments I will quote from that able writer and good scholar, Mr. G. A. Smith.¹ (2) "What seems decisive for the Exilic origin of chap. lxxv., is, that the possession of Judah and Zion by the seed of Jacob is still implied as future." This is an overstatement. The most natural inference from the facts is, I think, that which I have given above. (3) "The Holy Land is alluded to by the name common among the exiles in flat Mesopotamia ("my mountains"); and in contrast with the idolatry of which the present generation is guilty, the idolatry of their fathers is characterised as having been 'upon the mountains and upon the hills'; and again the people is charged with 'forgetting my holy mountain,' a phrase reminiscent of Ps. cxxxvii. 4, and more appropriate to a time of exile than when the people were gathered about Zion." Mr. Smith apparently thinks post-Exilic Palestinian writers could not, or at, least, would not, have written thus. But what ground is there for such an opinion? (a) The phrase, "my mountains," is borrowed from the historical Isaiah (Isa. xiv. 25), who resided, not in Mesopotamia, but in Palestine. It occurs, no doubt, once in Ezekiel (xxxviii. 21), of the mountains of Israel, and Ezekiel was an exile in Babylonia; but also of the mountains near Jerusalem in Zech. xiv. 5, which is certainly not of Exilic origin, and again in Isa. xlix. 11, not merely of the mountains of Canaan, but of those of the whole earth, of which Yahveh is the Lord. This last reference is not unimportant; it enables us to point to at least a slight discrepancy between the acknowledged Second Isaiah and the prophecy before us. (b) Mr. Smith's argument seems to require that the post-Exilic Jews should have reverted to hill-worship. I am ignorant of the evidence for this. (c) It seems to me too bold to claim that the phrase in ver. 11, "That forget my holy mountain," is a reminiscence of Ps. cxxxvii. 5; but I do venture to assert, what even Hengstenberg fully admits,

¹ *Exposition of Isaiah* xl.-lxvi., p. 458.

that Ps. cxxxvii. was not written in Babylon. If I understand them aright, both Dillmann and Mr. G. A. Smith take an opposite view, which I can only explain by the exigencies of controversy. Surely the picture in Ps. cxxxvii. is too idealised to be even based on the personal recollections of the author. The poet, who is a temple-singer, identifies himself imaginatively with his predecessors in exile, and tries in verses 1-4 to imagine their emotions, but in verses 5, 6, as Ewald saw, the feelings which he expresses are his own.

(4) "The practices in lxv. 3-5 are never attributed to the people before the Exile, were all possible in Babylonia, and some are known to have been actual then." The statement needs a somewhat close scrutiny. That heathen worship was carried on in gardens before the Exile is undeniable (see i. 29; lvii. 5). That burning incense upon the tilings of the houses was also a sin of the pre-Exile period is equally beyond question (see 2 Kings xxiii. 12; Zeph. i. 5; Jer. xix. 13). Mr. Smith would no doubt reply to the latter remark that, "upon the bricks" means "upon altars of brick," which were contrary to the law (Ex. xx. 24, 25), and presumably adopted from the Babylonians. This meaning of the phrase is perfectly possible, but is not at all more probable than the other view, that "upon the bricks" means "the tilings of the houses." To say that the phrase "upon the bricks" of itself points to Babylonia, is absurd (see ix. 9). And surely the offences complained of in lxv. 3 would be far more provocative of the divine anger in the land of Judah, after a legal sacrificial system had been fully introduced, than in Babylonia during the Exile, when (apart from any obscure heretical rites) sacrifices were necessarily in abeyance. When Mr. Smith adds that the practices complained of in vv. 3-5 were all possible in Babylonia, one does not care to dispute it, though it may fairly be held that the reference to tarrying in the graves (v. 4) points, in the first instance, to Palestine, where the rock-graves have in all ages been used

in emergencies as habitations. As to the practice of eating swine's flesh, it may no doubt have been borrowed during the Exile from the Babylonians; but the pig was so commonly regarded as a sacrificial animal, that we are by no means compelled to suppose that the heathenish Jews borrowed the custom referred to from Babylon. But we shall have to return to vv. 3-5 presently, in connection with a passage in chap. lxvi.

Let us now proceed to study (*k*) the last appendix (or the last part of the last appendix) of the Prophecy of Restoration, viz., Isaiah lxvi. That it has points of contact with chap. lxv. has been admittedly shown by Gesenius.¹ At the same time it is impossible to hold that chap. lxvi., as it now stands, was written as the sequel of chap. lxv. Vv. 1-4 have clearly no connection with the preceding, and no very close one with the following section. V. 5 seems to be an artificial link, combining lxvi. 1-4 with the sequel; and lxvi. 6 has all the appearance of being the opening of a fresh composition (cf. xiii. 4; xl. 3). The question must therefore be raised—Do these two parts of chap. lxvi. belong to the same period or not? It may plausibly be urged that vv. 1-4 were written while the Temple was still in ruins (else why the vehement apostrophe in v. 1b?) and vv. 6-24, after the sanctuary had been rebuilt (see vv. 6, 20). There are, in fact, some reasons for thinking that the description in 3*a* is suggested by Exilic circumstances, and since lxv. 3-5 is akin to these passages, it may be held that though the bulk of chaps.

¹ Gesenius, *Isaia*, dritter Theil (1821), p. 293. He maintains, in opposition to Eichhorn, Augusti, and Rosenmüller, that the conjunction of chaps. lxv. and lxvi. seems even closer and more original than that of the entire work (xl.—lxvi.); cf. lxv. 34; lxvi. 17; lxv. 5, lxvi. 5; lxv. 17; lxvi. 12; lxv. 12; lxvi. 16; the antitheses lxv. 11-14; lxvi. 3, 4, and the turn in lxv. 12, lxvi. 4. It is true Gesenius adds that the points of contact with the other chapters of the book are so numerous and important that there can be no thought of separating them. He fails to observe that these literary points of contact, which are opposed by the whole spirit of these two chapters, only prove that the author of Isaiah lxv., lxvi., knew the deutero-Isaianic work.

lxv. and lxvi. is post-Exilic, both lxv. 1-5 and lxvi. 1-4 (with which we must combine lxvi. 17) were inserted, either by the writer or by his editor, from an earlier document written during the Exile. It is quite possible, however, that appearances are here fallacious. lxvi. 1 may be simply a hyperbolic way of expressing the writer's depreciation of ritual (a depreciation fostered, as it would seem, by the bad heretical forms which had corrupted a part of the Jews). Considering that the existence of a non-sacrificial school in the post-Exilic period is attested by several passages in the Psalter, and that hyperbole is one of the commonest characteristics of Hebrew rhetoric, this view is by no means an improbable one. And with regard to the description of heathen practices in vv. 3, 4, must it not be supplemented not only by lxv. 3-5 and lxvi. 17, but by lxv. 17, which refers to the heathen cultus of Gad and M'nî? Now, if lxv. 17 is Palestinian and post-Exilic (which cannot reasonably be denied), is it not most natural to suppose that the rest of this group of passages belongs to the same period?

Of course, this argument will be overturned if the reasons referred to above for explaining lxvi. 3a by Exilic circumstances are cogent. These reasons have been set forth by Professor Robertson Smith in two suggestive passages of his *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*,¹ and his *Religion of the Semites*.² Isaiah lxvi. 1-4 and the parallel passages belong, according to this scholar, to the period of that later syncretism which sprang up about the period of the Assyrian captivity (see 2 Kings xvii. 24, 25). It was the time when the old national religions were breaking up; the gods of the peoples overcome by Assyria and Babylonia had proved unable to avert destruction, and men looked with sinking hearts for more potent means of binding the supernatural powers to their side than the old religions could afford. We find this newer syncretism not obscurely hinted at both in Deuteronomy and in Leviticus,

¹ Pp. 307-310.

² Pp. 325, 338-340.

where the list of forbidden foods, as Professor Robertson Smith has shown, has reference to the sacrificial meals of those initiated into the tribal mysteries of the heathen Semites. We find it also in the singular description in Ezek. viii. 10, 11, of the abominable rites practised in the temple itself by the heads of Judæan houses. So far I am at one with this eminent scholar. But it still remains to be determined whether the partly parallel description in passages of Isa. lxxv. and lxxvi. must be of Exilic origin (in order to bring it as near as possible to the earlier links in the chain of evidence), or whether we may hold that the heathen tribal mysteries exercised the same fascination upon the Jews in the more disastrous parts of the Persian rule as they did during the domination of Babylon. It appears to me that the second view ought not to be hastily dismissed. The secret superstitions of the Jews in later times are well known from the Talmud, and the Harranian mysteries, which seem to be alluded to in lxxvi. 3, lasted even down to Mohammedan times. If, therefore, apart from lxxv. 3-5, and lxxvi. 3, 17, chaps. lxxv. and lxxvi. are best understood as a post-Exilic work, and if even these verses may without any exegetical straining be so understood, is not the duty of the critic clear, viz., to assign the whole of these two chapters to the period to which, from their position, they most naturally belong, viz., the latter part of the Persian period?

But am I justified in asserting that the bulk of chap. lxxvi. is best understood as a post-Exilic work? Certainly, if chap. lxxvi. be really connected with chap. lxxv., which we have found to be post-Exilic, and if the general situation be allowed its full weight in the argument. But I am even willing to stake the issue on the general situation alone, putting aside for the moment the result which we have reached with regard to chap. lxxv. It may be described briefly thus: The temple has been rebuilt (lxxvi. 6-20), and the people are eagerly expecting "new heavens and a new earth" (lxxvi. 22; cf. lxxv. 17), *i.e.*, the full realisation of

their ideals, and a vengeance upon the wicked which exceeds all that previous ages have imagined (lxvi. 24). A bitterness unknown even at the close of the Babylonian Exile has penetrated the Jewish mind, upon which, however, as a background emerges the beautiful hope of the admission of the converted nations to the highest privileges of the people of God (lxvi. 21-23). Now to what part of the Persian period must we turn for an explanation of these facts? Surely to the beginning of the reign of the cruel Artaxerxes Ochus, and more particularly to his Syrian and Egyptian campaign. May it not even be conjectured that Isa. lxvi. 6, 15, 16, as well as Zech. xiv. 2,¹ is an anticipation of a siege of Jerusalem by that king, in whose army "all nations and tongues" (Isa. lxvi. 18) might, by an easy exaggeration, be said to be represented. There is no rationalistic dilution of the sense of the prophecy in this view. Apocalyptic hopes were already in the air, and the comfort of the pious Jew in trouble was the prospect that one of the terrible days which were coming upon them would be the thrice-blessed "day of Yahveh." It is true that the tone of chaps. lxv. and lxvi. is not the same as that of lxiii. 7—lxiv. But at other periods, too, (for instance, at the close of the Exile,) we find superficial differences between various prophetic writers. I have referred to this point in speaking of chap. lxv., and will only add that the extraordinary bitterness expressed towards the enemies of Israel, can only be understood at the very darkest part of the Persian period.

The only way to avoid this conclusion would be to find out some expressions in lxvi. 6-24, which point so distinctly to the Exile period as to counterbalance and neutralise all that can be produced on the other side. Dillmann, for instance, mentions the parallelism between lxvi. 7, and liv. 1; between lxvi. 11, and lx. 5, 16, lxi. 6, and between lxvi. 12, and lx. 4. He also maintains that

¹ Prof. Grätz takes this view of Zech. xiv. 2, *JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW*, Jan., 1891, p. 210

the phrase "in Jerusalem shall ye be comforted" (lxvi. 13b) implies that the persons addressed were not actually in Jerusalem. I am afraid, however, that the parallelisms only prove the acquaintance of the writer with the Second Isaiah's work, and as for the phrase, "in Jerusalem," why should not a prophet have used it in this context in the Persian period to emphasise the assurance of the national continuance? And if it is a fact that Artaxerxes Ochus drove a number of Jews into captivity, why may I not assume that to those who, before the terrible catastrophe, apprehended such a fate the prophet held out the reassuring promise, "in Jerusalem shall ye be comforted"? That the promise was not to all of them fulfilled is clearly no valid objection to such a view. Dillmann's too positive statement that the persons addressed must have been at a distance from Jerusalem reminds one of his inference from the words "that forget my holy mountain" in lxv. 11. In both cases his view of the meaning is, apart from the context, in itself a possible one. But that it is not necessary is shown in the one case by Ps. cxxxvii. 5, and in the other by Isa. xxx. 19, "For a people shall dwell in Zion, in Jerusalem,"¹ which was certainly addressed to inhabitants of Jerusalem.

Other conservative arguments may perhaps be based (1) on the names of peoples in lxv. 19, all of which occur in Ezekiel, and may, therefore, be regarded as pointing to an Exilic date, and (2) on the catholicity of the promise in v. 21 ("I will also take of them," *i.e.*, of the Gentile converts who shall bring the Jews home, "for priests, for Levites"), which may be said to remind one of the Second Isaiah rather than of the post-Exilic legalism. But as to (1), v. 19 forms part of a prophetic description, based indeed upon Ezekiel (see chaps. xxxviii., xxxix.), but thoroughly alien to the Second Isaiah, and parallel in part to Joel iii., and still more to Zech. xiv. (post-Exilic works); and with regard

¹ I know that Dillmann gives a different rendering of this passage, but grammatical probability seems to me to be against him.

to (2), it can, I believe, be shown that there was much greater freedom towards the ritual law in post-Exilic times than used to be supposed. It should be added that there are also linguistic grounds for denying vv. 18—24 to the Second Isaiah, viz., 1, the phrase “nations and tongues” (v. 18), which reminds us of the Maccabean Book of Daniel (Dan. iii. 4, 7, 29; iv. 1; v. 19; vi. 25; vii. 14; cf. also Zech. viii. 23); 2, the rare word כֶּפֶץ “litter,” which in this sense occurs again only in Num. vii. 3; 3, the ἀπ. λεγ. פִּרְקָרִית “dro-medaries” in v. 20, and 4, אֲבִיזָה “abomination,” v. 24, elsewhere only in Dan. xii. 2.

Thus everything tends to confirm the opinion that there is no part of chap. lxvi. which need be referred to Exilic, and much which must be assigned to post-Exilic times, and the precise period is seen to be the beginning of the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus. But, as I have admitted already, the chapter was not written straight on in its present form. Not only vv. 1-4, but vv. 17-24, were probably introduced later, scarcely by the same hand. The latter verses, however, contain nothing, so far as I can see, inconsistent with what has gone before, and need not have been written much later.

It will be a special satisfaction to me if I have been able to show that chaps. lxv. and lxvi. have no connection with the great evangelical prophecy of comfort and restoration. The conflicting and sometimes morbid thoughts which meet us in the former work are altogether unworthy of that noble religious thinker and preacher, the Second Isaiah, “dont l'âme lumineuse semble comme imprégnée, six cent ans d'avance, de toutes les rosées, de tous les parfums de l'avenir.”¹ I will not, however, take up your time with a comparative estimate of the different writers to whom the analytic criticism of Second Isaiah has introduced us; suffice it to express the hope that in any future history of the Jews in the post-Exilic period, the works (or some of the works)

¹ Renan, *L'Antéchrist*, p. 464.

which have now been reclaimed for the Persian age will not be neglected. My arguments have been chiefly historical and exegetical; I have compared, that is, the situation described in the several disputed sections both with that given in the acknowledged work of the Second Isaiah, and with the historical facts known to us, and sought to draw the necessary inferences. If space had permitted, I would have supplemented my argument by a detailed study of the linguistic phenomena both of the acknowledged and of the disputed prophecies. That much would have been gained by this I cannot, however, pretend to think. The case of the documents before us is somewhat different from that of the Psalms, which fall, as anyone can see, into several literary groups, whereas all the disputed passages of Isa. xl.—lxvi., with the exception of lvi. 9—lvii. 11a (13a), must be classed as upon the whole deutero-Isaianic. Here and there, of course, I have been compelled to take account of linguistic peculiarities (*e.g.*, in dealing with lvi. 9, etc., and with chap. lxvi.).

It only remains, first of all, in the briefest and clearest terms to sum up my results, and then to make due recognition of other scholars. The prophecy of the restoration of the Jews from Babylon, as it has come down to us, consists of two parts, viz., (1) a continuous series of discourses, chaps. xl.—xlviii.; and (2) a broken collection, composed of chaps. xlix. 1—lii. 12; lii. 13—liii. 12 (a later insertion by the author), liv., lv., lvi. 9—lvii. 21 (beginning with a long passage from an older prophet, which may either have been prefixed by the author, or more probably worked up with a deutero-Isaianic fragment by the editor), and lx.—lxii. Just as Book I. closed with, "Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from Chaldea," etc., so Book II. ends with, "Pass ye, pass ye through the gates; clear ye the way of the people," etc. The second book was probably, like Ecclesiastes, left incomplete by the author. This would make it all the easier for the Soferim, or students and editors of the religious literature, to insert or to append prophetic writings

of later origin. This editorial process was completed in the second half of the fourth century, when the second half of Isaiah assumed the form which it still bears.

"But are not these mere personal eccentricities?" No. I have already described the movement of disintegrating criticism down to the time of Ewald; let me now give a brief account of some of Ewald's successors. The conclusions of Ewald, which have formed my own starting-point, produced a strong impression on Friedrich Bleek. That sober-minded and devout scholar, whose posthumous Introduction to the Old Testament (first published in German in 1860, and translated by Venables in 1875) failed to meet with the success it deserved in England, fully admitted the fragmentary character of the latter part of the Second Isaiah's work. Some at least of the later prophecies were written, he thought, subsequently to the capture of Babylon by Cyrus, when the hope of the restoration of the Jewish people was still unfulfilled; and the very latest, *i.e.*, certainly chaps. lxiii.—lxvi., and perhaps from chap. lviii. onwards, were written as separate works, probably by the Second Isaiah, after both prophet and people had returned to Palestine. Nor was it only Christian scholars who were moving in the direction of disintegration. In 1868 we find the great Jewish scholar, Abraham Geiger, using this significant language—"the later Isaiah, whom I would regard, not as an individual, but as a collective person, as a succession of inspired seers from the call of Cyrus to the Greek period."¹ In 1875 Geiger repeated the same theory in more guarded terms:—"The second portion of Isaiah belongs, on the whole to the time of the Return and to the following period, but is made up of different parts."² Nowhere, however, does he give even a fragmentary justification of this seductive thesis. The next scholar to reassert the want of unity of the Second Isaiah's work was Oort, in *The Bible*

¹ *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vi. 90.

² *Ib.* xi. 40. Elsewhere Geiger speaks of "der Dichterkreis im jüngeren Jesaias" (*Nachgelassene Schriften*, iv. 170).

for *Young People* (Vol. IV., Eng. transl., 1875), who, in his general view, reminds us of Bleek, but in his details anticipates the bolder criticism of Kuenen. The views of Stade are to be found in some of the notes to chap. vii. of Part II. of his history. His concessions to disintegrating criticism are not as great as might have been expected; he speaks of lvi. 1-8 as in the full sense deutero-Isaianic, and assumes a deutero-Isaianic basis for the later or even latest chapters. His favourite keys for unlocking the problems of criticism are the theories of interpolation and editorial manipulation. We must wait till this keen critic has time to give us his matured opinion on these questions; he is at any rate more in sympathy with the advanced than with the stationary critics.

We now come to Kuenen, who has given us the results of a thorough study of these problems in the second edition of his *Onderzoek*. He, too, has developed, like other people. Whenever the history of Biblical criticism in the nineteenth century is written, the singular combination of caution and boldness which distinguishes this eminent critic will not fail to be recognised. In the first edition of his second volume, published in 1865, Kuenen advocated a view of the origin and arrangement of Isa. xl.-lxvi., which would now be called in a high degree conservative. In his second edition, however, published in 1889, he carries the analysis of these chapters to the farthest point that it has yet reached, or, as I venture modestly to hope, that it will reach. The Prophecy of Restoration consists, according to him, of chaps. xl.-xlix., lii. 1-12, and perhaps lii. 13—liii. 12. The remaining portions of the second half of Isaiah, which all presuppose a Palestinian Jewish community, were written, he thinks, after the Return, some by the Second Isaiah, but more by writers who belonged to the same circle, or who, if they were of the next generation, held in honour and sought to propagate the traditions of this circle. With regard to lvi. 9—lvii. 11a, he says that it may very likely be a pre-Exilic

passage, but that if so, lvii. 11b-20, must be addressed to persons who, in some respects, resembled the pre-Exilic Jews, *i.e.*, who had a national existence in Palestine, and were not wholly free from the sins which the older prophet had denounced. Another important critical remark is that lxiii. 7-lxiv. is most naturally explained by the facts recorded in Neh. i. 3, or by still later occurrences of the same kind. Probably in the fifth century, he says, all the prophecies were brought together in a volume and arranged.

I have next the pleasure of referring to the commentary on Isaiah, which has taken the place of Knobel's, in the *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch*. Dillmann's other contributions to this series are well known, and the present work is in many respects worthy to be set beside his volumes on the Hexateuch. It would not be difficult, I admit, to find something to carp at. The author is not quite in touch with the most recent critics. He seems to feel it his mission to put a drag on what may seem to him the too great eagerness of other scholars. It would be not unnatural that some of those who feel that there has been a danger of stagnation in Old Testament criticism should be annoyed at his attitude towards them. But I confess that I am myself not so much displeased that he has adopted so little from the more "advanced" school as grateful that he has assimilated so much. It is not impossible that conservative scholars may soon begin to quote Dillmann against progress in Isaiah criticism. I venture, in anticipation, to controvert their position, and to claim him as an ally. This great scholar sees clearly enough that Isaiah xl.-lxvi. does not, as it stands, form a true whole. But the unity of form, and that of tone and subject-matter, are, he admits, very imperfectly present. As to the former, there are considerable differences of style. In lii. 13-liii. 12, in lviii. and lix., and, most clearly of all, in lvi. 9-lvii. 13a, the language of earlier prophets appears to have been more or less adopted, and there is much reason to

doubt whether lxiii. 7—lxvi. 24 has escaped later alterations. Chap. lxvi., in particular, from the abruptness of its transitions, and in vv. 18-24 the strangeness of the style and ideas, is liable to this suspicion. And as to the latter kind of unity, it is clear from Part II. of Isaiah xl.—lxvi. that the author had had to moderate the high hopes with which he started. A general amendment of Israel had proved to be hopeless, and the prophet accordingly devoted himself to a criticism, which became continually sharper, of the moral state of the people. The promised redemption was delayed, and of this Israel's wickedness was the cause. Part II. (l.—lxii. 12) must, therefore, be placed between B.C. 549 and 539/8. The appendices in chaps. lxiii.—lxvi. moreover contrast with Part II. as much as Part II. contrasts with Part I. They reveal an intense sorrow in the prophet at the vanity of his previous exhortations, and are indirectly a record of affairs on the eve of Israel's restoration. In chap. lxvi., indeed, the permission of Cyrus to return seems to be presupposed, and the prophecy is apparently addressed to those who are taking steps to avail themselves of it. It is impossible not to see in all this that Dillmann has been moved almost in spite of himself by the most recent current of criticism.

The last of the scholars whom I have to refer to on this question as friends and allies is Mr. George Adam Smith, whose exposition of Isaiah, in spite of its incompleteness and somewhat homiletical character, should not be neglected by the student. From an English point of view this criticism may be called "advanced," and the peculiarity of the book is that "advanced" arguments and conclusions are set forth in such a way as to seem plausible even to untrained or half-trained readers. And what is his main result? He expresses it in these words, "That Second Isaiah is not a unity, in so far as it consists of a number of pieces by different men, whom God raised up at different times before, during, and after the Exile, to comfort and exhort amid the shifting circumstances and tempers of his

people ; but that it is a unity in so far as these pieces have been gathered together by an editor very soon after the Return from the Exile, in an order as regular, both in point of time and subject, as the somewhat mixed material would permit."

Obviously this is a somewhat more "advanced" view than Dillmann's, who dogmatically asserts (p. 362) that the view that Isa. xl. to lxvi. is the collective product of a succession of inspired seers of the Persian period has no claim to be recognised. It must be added, however, that though Mr. G. A. Smith does not insist on the unity of authorship, nor on that of tone and situation, he is not as yet convinced that any considerable part of Isa. xl.—lxvi. was written in Palestine after the Return. His exposition of chap. lxvi. indeed, taken literally, seems opposed to his earlier statement that some of the writers, who collectively produced the Book of the Second Isaiah, lived subsequently to the Exile. Possibly his real meaning is that those features of chap. lxvi., which appear to speak for the period of the Return, were introduced by a later writer to adapt the passage to the wants of his own time.

One more remark and I have done. It seems to me that both Dillmann and Mr. G. A. Smith have a tendency to assign too many literary products to a single short period. They pack too many dissimilar prophecies together into the closing years of the Exile, and consistency will probably compel them to combine too many prophetic and poetic works in the second part of the reign of Josiah—too many, I mean, for the historic intelligibility of the picture thus produced. For I believe that one of the best criteria of the accuracy of a result of Old Testament criticism is its adaptability to the framework of a history of Israel. Ewald summed up more or less the criticism of the first half of this century in his *History of the People of Israel*; it may be reserved for some already living university student to sum up the criticism of the second in a no less epoch-making work.

T. K. CHEYNE.